Section 1: Feedback on the overall portfolio

1.1 Relevance of the proposed portfolio	
a) **Relevance:** Do you agree that the overall portfolio of European Partnerships (existing partnerships and new candidates combined) responds to the landscape of EU priorities?	Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree
b) **Impact:** Do you agree that the overall portfolio of European Partnerships (existing partnerships and new candidates combined) leverages R&I adequately to deliver positive impacts for the EU and its citizens?	Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree
c) **Coverage:** How do you assess the level of diversification (topics and thematic areas covered) of partnerships in the overall portfolio (existing partnerships and new candidates combined)?	Very adequate; Somewhat adequate; Neutral ; Not very adequate; not adequate at all
d) **Overall coherence:** To what extent do you find the overall portfolio of European Partnerships (existing partnerships and new candidates combined) coherent as a whole?	Very coherent; Somewhat coherent; Neutral ; Not very coherent; not coherent at all
e) **Complementarity of the new candidates:** Overall, to what extent do you find the new candidate partnerships complementary to the 49 partnerships that were included in the first Strategic Plan?	Very complementary; Somewhat complementary; Neutral ; Not very complementary; not complementary at all
f) **Ranking:** How would you rank the new candidates in terms of their overall relevance and priority?	Brain Health; Forests and Forestry for a Sustainable Future; Innovative Materials for EU (I'M for EU); In-Orbit Demonstration and Validation; Raw Materials for the Green and Digital Transition; Resilient Cultural Heritage; Social Transformations and Resilience; Solar Photovoltaics; Textiles of the Future; Virtual Worlds
Please provide **any additional comments** on this section as you see fit:	[free text, max 2000 characters]
1.2 Rationalisation and reform of the European Partnerships landscape under Horizon Europe	

a) **Overall rationalisation**: How satisfied are you with the level of rationalisation in terms of the number and relevance of European Partnerships proposed under Horizon Europe overall (existing partnerships and new candidates combined), in comparison to the partnership landscape under Horizon 2020?	Very satisfied ; Somewhat satisfied ; Neutral ; Not very satisfied ; Not at all Satisfied
b) Overall reform: How satisfied are you with the level of reform (in terms of ambition of objectives, composition of partners etc.) of European Partnerships proposed under Horizon Europe overall (existing partnerships and new candidates combined), in comparison to the partnership landscape under Horizon 2020?	Very satisfied ; Somewhat satisfied ; Neutral ; Not very satisfied ; Not at all Satisfied
c) **Further rationalisation of the proposed candidate portfolio:** Based on the new policy approach and criteria for establishing European Partnerships, are there any proposed candidate partnerships which you consider are not justified to be launched as such?	Yes ; No
[if yes] Please specify which of the proposed candidates is not suited to be launched as a European Partnership	Brain Health; Forests and Forestry for a Sustainable Future; Innovative Materials for EU (I'M for EU); In-Orbit Demonstration and Validation; Raw Materials for the Green and Digital Transition; Resilient Cultural Heritage; Social Transformations and Resilience; Solar Photovoltaics; Textiles of the Future; Virtual Worlds
[if yes to 2c] Please provide an explanation as to why the above identified candidates are not suited to be launched as an European Partnership	[free text, max 2000 characters]
Please provide **any additional comments** on this section as you see fit:	[free text, max 500 characters]
Please indicate if the following Partnership candidates are relevant for your organisation, or not:	Brain Health; Forests and Forestry for a Sustainable Future; Innovative Materials for EU (I'M for EU); In-Orbit Demonstration and Validation; Raw Materials for the Green and Digital Transition;

	Resilient Cultural Heritage; Social Transformations and Resilience; Solar Photovoltaics; Textiles of the Future; Virtual Worlds

Section 2: Thematic relevance of the candidate (per Partnership)

Please rate the relevance of the proposed European Partnership for:	
a) Your **national policies and priorities**	Very relevant ; moderately relevant; slightly relevant ; not relevant ; no opinion
b) Your **research organisations** including **universities** at national level	Very relevant ; moderately relevant; slightly relevant ; not relevant ; no opinion
c) Your **industry**	Very relevant ; moderately relevant; slightly relevant ; not relevant ; no opinion
d) What **national/regional R&I strategies**, plans and/or programmes exist, if any, in support of the given area?	☐ National R&I strategy and/or plan ☐ National economic; sectoral strategy and/or plan with a strong emphasis on research and/or innovation ☐ Dedicated R&I funding programme or instrument ☐ Regional R&I and/or smart specialisation strategies ☐ Other, please specify: …. ☐ None
e) **EU action:** Considering your national R&I landscape, how do you assess the necessity for action at EU level in this area?	Very high; High; Medium; Low; None
Are there **aspects that could be reinforced** in the proposal for this partnership that would **increase its relevance for your national priorities?**	[free text, max 500 characters]
Please provide **any additional comments** on the relevance of this proposed candidate partnership:	[free text, max 500 characters]
2.1 **Appropriateness of using a European Partnership approach**	
Note: Please assess how well the proposed candidate fulfils a limited set of criteria from the Annex III of the Horizon Europe Regulation. These limited criteria were proposed as the candidates are still at a conceptual stage; thus, factors such as openness and transparency (regarding the identification of priorities and objectives, as well as the involvement of diverse partners), ex-ante	

interest or commitments by partners, flexibility of implementation, and a credible phase out strategy cannot be assessed yet, but can only be taken into account later on in the process.	
Overall: How appropriate do you consider the use of a partnership approach in addressing this specific priority?	Very appropriate ; somewhat appropriate; not very appropriate ; not appropriate at all; no opinion
Please rate to what extent the proposal fulfils the following criteria:	
a) Effectiveness: A European Partnership is more effective in achieving the objectives of the candidate than traditional instruments (e.g. standard Horizon Europe calls)	Fulfils the criterion; Somewhat fulfils the criterion; Does not fulfil the criterion; Insufficient information to assess
b) Directionality: clear objectives and impacts	Fulfils the criterion; Somewhat fulfils the criterion; Does not fulfil the criterion; Insufficient information to assess
c) Additionality: demonstration of clear EU added value	Fulfils the criterion; Somewhat fulfils the criterion; Does not fulfil the criterion; Insufficient information to assess
d) Coherence and synergies: creating and improving coherence and synergies within the EU R&I landscape	Fulfils the criterion; Somewhat fulfils the criterion; Does not fulfil the criterion; Insufficient information to assess
In case of **identified shortcomings of the proposal**, please which **specify aspect(s), could be improved to align the proposal better with Annex III of the Horizon Europe Regulation**:	[free text, max 1000 characters]
Please provide **any additional comments** on the appropriateness of using a European Partnership approach to achieve the objectives of this proposed candidate:	[free text, max 500 characters]
2.4 Complementarity of the candidate	
a) **Potential overlaps with existing partnerships:** How do you assess the level of risk for potential overlaps between existing European Partnerships and this candidate?	Very high; High; Medium; Low; None
Please elaborate	[free text, max 500 characters]
b) **Potential overlaps with other EU initiatives/programmes:** How do you assess the level of risk for potential overlaps between other EU initiatives or programmes that are ongoing in this sector and this candidate?	Very high; High; Medium; Low; None
Please elaborate	[free text, max 500 characters]
c) **Potential synergies with existing European Partnerships:** How do you assess the potential for synergies between existing partnerships and this candidate?	Very high; High; Medium; Low; None
Please elaborate	[free text, max 500 characters]
d) **Potential synergies with other EU initiatives/programmes:** How do you assess the	Very high; High; Medium; Low; None

potential for synergies between other EU initiatives or programmes that are ongoing in this sector and this candidate?	
Please elaborate	[free text, max 500 characters]